



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/881,763

06/18/2001

Catharine Anne Maple

1509-189

8249

7590

03/25/2004

IP Administration
C/o Hewlett-Packard Company
3404 East Harmony Road
Mailstop 35
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, GLENDA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,763

Applicant(s)

MAPLE ET AL

Examiner

Glenda P. Rodriguez

Art Unit

2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonoyama et al. (WO 99/50850) in view of Nieuwkerk (US Patent No. 5, 905, 600) and Bui et al. (US Patent No. 6, 532, 128).

Regarding Claim 1, 7, 8 and 10, Nonoyama et al. teach a method/program/medium of locating a position on a linear data storage medium from which to write data, said method comprising the steps of:

Transporting the data storage medium past a read head (WO 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 4-15);

Reading a linear position data describing a linear position along said data storage medium and from said linear position data (WO 99/50850; Page 18, Line 26 to Page 19, Line 8 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. Nonoyama et al. indicates that as soon as the data is recorded, each has its own append identification data that help the controller to identify the last append point to which data can be thus stored.);

Art Unit: 2651

Determining an approximate position of an append position from which to start writing data by responding to the read linear position (WO 99/50850; Page 6, Lines 18-22);

Having found said approximate position of said append point, reading an absolute block identifier number to identify individual block along the length of said data storage medium (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. Nonoyama et al. indicates that when appending data, the tape reel is reeled, detecting the target append point by the detectors. Nonoyama et al. indicates that by using the controller, the medium reads the data, comparing it with the controller, until finding the target append data identification.);

Comparing said read head absolute block with a target absolute block (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. Nonoyama et al. indicates that by using the controller, the medium reads the data, comparing it with the controller.);

Finding a correspondence between said read absolute block and said target absolute block (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. Nonoyama et al. indicates that by using the controller, the medium reads the data, comparing it with the controller, until finding the target append data identification.);

If a match between said read absolute block and said target absolute block is found, then generating an interrupt signal to interrupt transport of said data

Art Unit: 2651

storage medium past said read head (WO 99/50850; Page 10, Line 11 to Page 11 Line 25 and Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. It is known that in order for a magnetic tape to change operations from searching to writing or reading, an interrupt signal has to be emitted in order for the medium to recognize that the target data has been found.);

And commencing a write operation from a position of said read absolute block which matches said target absolute block (WO 99/50850; Page 10, Line 11 to Page 11 Line 25 and Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9. Nonoyama et al. indicates that the medium can perform both reading and writing unless the medium indicates otherwise.).

Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45). Nonoyama et al. and Nieuwkerk fail to teach that the position data is linear position data. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Bui et al., wherein it teaches a tape that appends the data by reading the linear position (Pat. No. 6, 532, 128; Col. 5, Line 66 to Col. 6, Line 24.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to synchronoze the head with the recording media.

Art Unit: 2651

Regarding Claims 4 and 12, Nonoyama et al. disclose a method of locating an append point along a length of linear storage medium (WO 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 4-15 and Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9), said append point indicating a position onto which data are to be written along said linear data storage medium (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9), said method comprising the steps of:

Reading a plurality of absolute Block numbers from at least one track of said data storage medium (WO 99/50850; Page 10, Line 28 to Page 11, Line 25. Nonoyama et al. teach that data is placed in groups in each read track, each track having its own append data different from the other groups.);

Comparing said read absolute Block number with a pre-stored target absolute Block number (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9. Nonoyama et al. indicates that by using the controller, the medium reads the data, comparing it with the controller.);

Finding a match between a read absolute Block number and said stored target absolute Block number (WO 99/50850; Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9. Nonoyama et al. indicates that by using the controller, the medium reads the data, comparing it with the controller, until finding the target append data identification.);

Generating an interrupt signal for interrupt of transport of said tape data storage medium based on the found match (WO 99/50850; Page 10, Line 11 to Page 11 Line 25 and Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9. It is known that in order for a magnetic tape to change operations from searching to

Art Unit: 2651

writing or reading, an interrupt signal has to be emitted in order for the medium to recognize that the target data has been found.).

Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45). Nonoyama et al. and Nieuwkerk fail to teach that the position data is linear position data. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Bui et al., wherein it teaches a tape that appends the data by reading the linear position (Pat. No. 6, 532, 128; Col. 5, Line 66 to Col. 6, Line 24.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to synchronoze the head with the recording media.

Apparatus claim 11 is drawn to the apparatus corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claim 4. Therefore apparatus claim 11 corresponds to method claim 4, and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Regarding Claim 2, Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Nonoyama et al. also teach reading at least one absolute block (W0 99/50850; Page 10, Line 28 to Page 11, Line 12. Nonoyama et al. teach that each segment of data is packed into groups, each segment having a sub-code in order to segment or distinguish each segment of data.). Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain

Art Unit: 2651

code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45).

Regarding Claim 3, Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Nonoyama et al. also teach a method that further comprises distinguishing between a first and second written block within a same block, by searching for a synchronization field selected from the set (W0 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 15-27. Nonoyama et al. discloses that each group has a particular append point in each group of code words.); a forward synchronization field; a back synchronization field and a re-synchronizing field (W0 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 18-25 and Page 16, Lines 10-14. Nonoyama et al. indicates that the tape is able to move forward and backwards during searching.). Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45).

Regarding Claim 5, Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 4. Nonoyama et al. also teach distinguishing between a pair of absolute block numbers read from a pair of block within a block (W0 99/50850; Page 10, Line 28 to Page 11, Line 12. Nonoyama et al. teach that each segment of data is packed into groups, each segment having a sub-code in order to segment or distinguish each segment of data.); selecting said append point

Art Unit: 2651

as a first said block within said block (W0 99/50850; Page 10, Line 28 to Page 11, Line 25. Nonoyama et al. teach that many data segments are placed in groups in each track, each track having its own append point different from the other groups.). Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45).

Regarding Claim 6, Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Nonoyama et al. also teach a method that further comprises distinguishing between a first and second written block within a same block, by searching for a synchronization field selected from the set (W0 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 15-27. Nonoyama et al. discloses that each group has a particular append point in each group of code words.); a forward synchronization field; a back synchronization field, a re-synchronizing field (W0 99/50850; Page 9, Lines 18-25 and Page 16, Lines 10-14. Nonoyama et al. indicates that the tape is able to move forward and backwards during searching.) and a data separating field (W0 99/50850; Page 10, Line 28 to Page 11, Line 25. Nonoyama et al. teach that many data segments are placed in groups in each track, each track having its own append point different from the other groups.). Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at

Art Unit: 2651

the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45).

Regarding Claim 13, Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 12. Nonoyama et al. further teach responding to the interrupt signal by commencing a write operation from a position of said read absolute block which matches said target absolute block (WO 99/50850; Page 10, Line 11 to Page 11 Line 25 and Page 15, Lines 7-14 and Page 15 Line 26 to Page 16, Line 9 and Page 6, Lines 3-22. It is known that in order for a magnetic tape to change operations from searching to writing or reading, an interrupt signal has to be emitted in order for the medium to recognize that the target data has been found. Nonoyama et al. indicates that the medium can perform both reading and writing unless the medium indicates otherwise.). Nonoyama et al. fail to teach that the block is actually a code word. However, this feature is well known in the art as disclosed by Nieuwkerk, wherein it teaches that blocks contain code words (Pat. No. 5, 905, 600; Col. 4, Lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al.'s invention in order to use code words in order to improve the capabilities for recording data signals (Pat. No. 1, Lines 43-45).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonoyama et al. (WO 99/50850), Nieuwkerk and Bui et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Sakamoto (US Pat. No. 4, 390, 909). Nonoyama et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 8. Nonoyama et al. fail to teach comprising a read only memory device (i.e., ROM). However, this feature is well known in the art, as disclosed by Sakamoto, wherein it discloses a tape drive with a ROM (Pat. No. 4, 390, 909; See Fig. 5, elements 31, 32, 33 Sakamoto indicates that these

Art Unit: 2651

elements are ROM memory devices). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Nonoyama et al., Nieuwkerk and Bui et al.'s invention in order for the medium to more efficiently monitor the scanning of data.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection due to the newly amended claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Yamasaki et al. (US Patent No. 5, 731, 922) and Coleman et al. (US Patent No. 5, 339, 108).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenda P. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703)305-8411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 7:00-5:00; alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (703)308-4825. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


GPR
March 9, 2004.


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600